



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Soliloquy in German Drama. By ERWIN W. ROESSLER, Ph. D.
New York, Columbia University Press, 1915.

After defining the monolog or dramatic soliloquy, Dr. Roessler gives the following classification: (1). Expository or information soliloquies (introduction, self-identification, self-characterization, narrative, descriptive, intentional); (2). Introspective soliloquies (thought and emotional). The Introduction then closes with the following statement of the scope and purpose of the author's investigation: "1). What rôle does the soliloquy play in the technic of the various German dramatists? 2). Is dramatic technic improved by the elimination of the soliloquy?"

In the main body of the work there are six chapters: I. Early Indigenous Drama [(1). Medieval Church Plays; (2). Shrovetide Plays of the Fifteenth Century; (3). Drama of the Reformation; (4). Hans Sachs; (5). Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig; (6). Jakob Ayer]; II. The Pseudo-Classic Drama [(1). Gryphius; (2). Lohenstein; (3). Christian Weise; (4). Gottsched and his Followers]; III. The Era of Lessing, Goethe, Schiller [(1). Lessing; (2). Storm and Stress; (3). Schiller; (4). Goethe]; IV. The Romantic Movement [(1). Heinrich von Kleist; (2). Grillparzer]; V. Forerunners of Modern Realistic Drama [(1). Friedrich Hebbel; (2). Otto Ludwig; (3). Ludwig Anzengruber]; VI. Recent Developments [(1). Hauptmann; (2). Sudermann]. Then follows the Conclusion.

The book of 121 pages contains, too, a table of contents, a bibliography, and an index.

Considering the separate chapters in detail, one finds the technic of the soliloquy in the early indigenous drama very crude. Before Hans Sachs real soliloquies, except a few of emotion, do not occur. With him there came a change, for in his plays the expository, the moralizing, and the emotional monologs abound everywhere. And there is some improvement in technic; the words of explanation or information are no longer simply addressed to the audience, and stage directions are, at times, added to make the production somewhat more realistic.—In the dramas of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig English influence becomes evident. Moralizing and ranting monologs are preferred to all others; the technic is still quite crude, but stage directions receive more attention.—Jakob Ayer again falls below the standard set by Hans Sachs.

The Pseudo-Classic drama shows various changes in the use of the monolog, much depending in each case upon the foreign model or influence. In the tragedies of Andreas Gryphius dramatic soliloquies, tho long and full of bombast, ranting, dejection, and pessimism, are not of frequent occurrence. An effort seems to be made to wrap expository matters in an emotional coating.—As to technic, Lohenstein is much like Gryphius, showing the same fondness for philosophic reflections and florid rhetoric. In his dramas, however, the monolog occurs less frequently and is not so full of ranting.—Christian Weise, on the other hand, uses very many soliloquies and of the crudest type; in respect to technic he stands but little in advance of the 15th and 16th Centuries.—Hostile to all but short soliloquies of emotion, Gottsched, in his turn, caused the avoidance of the convention in the drama of his pupils and followers, tho himself using a few in *Cato*.

In his chapter on the era of Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe, Dr. Roessler first discusses the technic of the soliloquy in Lessing's early comedies. It stands on a much lower plane than in his later dramas. In the early plays the monologs served, for the most part, a mere mechanical purpose, a linking of scenes; in the later, they form essential parts of the dramatic structure, having direct bearing on plot or characterization. At first, there is a scarcity of realistic touches, emotional outbursts, apostrophes, and the like; the soliloquies are undramatic, full of philosophic and moralizing reflections, and of bits of self-characterization: later, the language is simple and natural; there are apostrophes, questions and answers, various emotions, reflections, or deliberations that often end with the revelation of a plan or intention. There is but little self-characterization, philosophic reflection or moralizing; the speech, in each case, is made to appear, as much as possible, like thinking aloud.

The use of the soliloquy in the Storm and Stress drama resembles Lessing's technic. There is, to be sure, more ranting, but, at the same time, also more stage directions together with pantomime or silent expression of emotion.

In Schiller's dramas a change of attitude toward monologs becomes evident. Before *Don Carlos*, he used them in great numbers and embellished them with rhetorical phrases; later, they occur less frequently and are more natural in language and construction, more and more attention being paid to pantomime and realistic stage directions. Expository soliloquies, when present, usually

form a small part of some other type; thought monologs are more numerous than the emotional.

Goethe, for his part, made no attempt to avoid using soliloquies. In his later dramas the convention is, in fact, used more freely than in his earlier works; and, according to Goethe's nature, it gradually becomes more and more lyric and elegiac. The various types are represented; among them the descriptive and the emotional appear most frequently. Monologs full of violent inner conflict are more numerous than the calm and purely deliberative. In fact, an emotional admixture is found in all types. In style and structure Goethe aimed more and more at greater formal beauty.

When discussing Kleist as a representative of the Romantic drama, it seems hard for Dr. Roessler to give him any claim to distinction. Recognizing the weakness of the confidant, Kleist refused to make use of this expedient. And for this, in my mind, he deserves credit. Nor should it, according to Dr. Roessler, be ascribed to Kleist's power that he used soliloquies sparingly, their absence being due to the fact that Kleist's characters were full of action. But who saw the dramatic possibilities in these characters, and who elected to treat them? The question is then asked, whether Kleist would have written *Tasso* without soliloquies. But he never would have chosen Tasso as a subject for a stage production. Again, it is claimed that the scarcity of soliloquies in some of Kleist's dramas is off-set by the "undramatic form and crudity" of the monologs in *Käthchen von Heilbronn*. But the weakness and crudity of one play do not annul the beauty and power of the others. Poets are not always at their best. Finally, the style of the soliloquy does not find favor, either. And yet it is the very style of the soliloquies that are now being introduced into the drama of today.

In his use of the soliloquy, Grillparzer was much like Goethe and Schiller. Like the latter he made use of stage directions and gradually diminished the power of the monolog in his plays. The various types of soliloquy are represented; the style improves thruout, a trend toward beautiful expression being evident. According to Dr. Roessler, Grillparzer "does not reach the level set by Schiller and Goethe in the technic of the soliloquy, firstly because of the numerous narrative and descriptive soliloquies" (p. 86); but on page 81, one reads concerning Grillparzer that "nar-

rative passages in soliloquies are rather infrequent," and in Goethe's dramas "descriptive soliloquies are of frequent occurrence" (p. 64.) So the difference is not very great. The accounts of what is going on off the stage, mentioned on page 83, belong under narrative rather than descriptive soliloquies.

In the chapter on the Forerunners of Modern Realistic Drama, Friedrich Hebbel is shown to be fond of soliloquies. This is justified by Hebbel's introspective and self-analyzing nature. The monologs have some virtues, such as apostrophes, exclamations, questions and answers, etc.; but their weakness far outweighs their strength, for Hebbel's technic stands on a lower level than Goethe's or Schiller's. In coming to this conclusion, Dr. Roessler does not, however, contrast the early with the later plays.—Otto Ludwig's technic of the soliloquy is excellent, the speeches being short, dramatic, and well applied. But Dr. Roessler does not consider him an innovator, merely true to classical tradition. Ludwig Anzengruber does not receive full treatment. His technic is merely declared that of the classical period, altho he eschews purely expository monologs and "reminds one of Ibsen's technic."

The chapter on Recent Developments shows that Hauptmann and Sudermann do not use soliloquies to any great degree in their realistic dramas, but accept the convention in their idealistic plays. In his revitalized Greek dramas, Hofmannsthal uses soliloquies that are rather dramatic. And in the Romantic dramas of Hardt and Stucken, the monologs are good and not very numerous.

In the Conclusion, the second part of the aim and purpose of the author's research is taken up: "Is dramatic technic improved by the elimination of the soliloquy?" And the answer, in brief, is: dramatic technic has suffered by avoiding the monolog; for its substitutes, facial expression and pantomime, cannot reveal a character's attitude, the conflicting emotions of his heart, nor his inner thoughts.

Viewed as a whole, the treatise is full of interest and quite instructive, but calls for various comments. For a doctor's dissertation it contains too much that is elementary and extraneous. Why tell us from Froning, for instance, that the medieval church plays had their origin in four Latin sentences of the Catholic ritual? And a work on the soliloquy should not devote so many pages to discussion of the medieval stage, the rise of the Reformation plays, and the history of English influence on the German

drama. The treatise was not to be a history of German dramas and dramatists. Again, it seems doubtful whether it was necessary to characterize the Storm and Stress movement and Otto Ludwig, as they were; above all, when all is already known from any history of German literature. Furthermore, too much mere quoting from such histories appears, for example, under Anzengruber and in the description of Ibsen's influence upon the German drama. And much of this material is not always to the point. Some remarks, moreover, are out of their proper place. The discussion of the fact, for instance, that "the classification has been made with reference to the predominating element" should appear in the Introduction and not on page 74.

The style of the book is in some respects peculiar. Many phrases appear to be rather out of place, somewhat racy and familiar: e. g., "the soliloquy has . . . been ruthlessly ousted from its comfortable throne," p. 1; "getting the story across is the main object of the author," p. 28; "and finally perforce resort to a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde theory to account for the exuberant humor and the genuine tomfoolery," p. 38; "our old friends, the self-identifying and self-characterizing soliloquy," p. 40; "the soliloquy is compelled to slink off the scene of its former triumphs," p. 41; "to transmute a convention into a 'slice of life,'" p. 42; "to produce weird excrescences upon the tree of sane expression," p. 51; "a battlefield covered with the disjecta membra of the combatants," p. 52; "a choice assortment of emotional outbursts," p. 52; "he regales us with an allegro furioso on the theme Spitzbube," p. 60. Many words and phrases are often repeated: e. g., bald, baldly, ranting, tear passion to tatters, ad spectatores.

Of misprints there are a few. The chief ones follow: rôle = rôle, p. 1; techinc = technic, p. 2; Escarbagnnes = Escarbagnes, p. 9; Ayres = Ayrsers, p. 33 (note); Benfy = Benfey, pp. 76-78 (twice); Silberglöckchen = Silberglöckchen, p. 82; deflective = reflective, p. 83; is = ist, p. 104; Meyer = Meyer-Benfey, p. 114 (if one is to judge from the juggling of Meyer-Benfey's name, Dr. Roessler was not very familiar with his work on Kleist); III = II, p. 48; III.6 = III.7, p. 57; IV = V, 11 = 12, 16 = 17, p. 64 (note); 3581-3620 = 3587-3619, p. 73; III = II, p. 83 (note); 3677-86, Faust I, is not a soliloquy; here and there some commas should have been added.

Dr. Roessler's problem was not a difficult one. The way for its solution had been well prepared by Arnold, Berger, Düsel, Franz, Matthews, Paull, and others. Nor did anything very troublesome present itself; the work is, to a large extent, a tabulation, epoch by epoch, type by type, of the soliloquies of some representative German dramas. There was but little racking of the brain required; for classification, based on "the predominating element," is, on the whole, quite easy. And some problems were avoided: e.g., the difference between comedies and tragedies in regard to the technic of the soliloquy in the case of Gryphius, Lessing, and Ludwig. The author should have noted and examined this characteristic.

G. C. L. RIEMER.

Bucknell University.

The Use of the Infinitive Instead of a Finite Verb in French, by B. F. LUKER. New York: Columbia Press, 1916. 115 pp.

In this Columbia dissertation, Mr. Luker, restricting his investigation to the French field, takes up the four types of infinitive used in place of a finite verb and interprets them all as due to ellipsis. Two of the four do not to-day need a rediscussion to carry conviction: ellipsis of a verb of necessity is back of the modern French infinitive in brief notices and directions; and from the time Gaston Paris named the verb to be supplied with the *or del bien faire* group, it has hardly been worth questioning that the omitted form is the imperative of *penser*. In the latter case Mr. Luker's extensive collection of examples for the non-elliptical and the elliptical phraseology is of interest and value in showing the completeness of the parallel between the two.

There remain the Old French infinitive in the place of the imperative in prohibitions, and the so-called historical infinitive. Ellipsis is by no means self-evident in these instances, and if it furnishes the solution, a definite demonstration of this is to be welcomed.

In the prohibitory infinitive (*amis, nel dire ja*) Mr. Luker sees ellipsis of *vueilles* or *voilliez*, and believes the construction to be derived from the Latin *noli, nolite* + inf., which would account for its restriction to prohibitions. The only positive argument ad-